

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/23/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues on page 6 of the response in essence that:

Fan '706 does not disclose determining whether access to a server specified by a network address is permitted or not.

a. Fan '706 discloses determining whether a packet meets authorization criteria which includes an IP address (step 406 of Fig. 4, col. 9, lines 16-23).

Based on the determination, the packet is either permitted to pass or is dropped (col. 9, lines 32-40, 60-67).

The applicant argues on page 7 of the response in essence that:

Fan '706 does not disclose a situation where a received network address is not included in access restriction information, and access to a specified server is permitted is determined in accordance with default settings.

b. Fan '706 discloses an uninvited packet [not listed in the access control list] may be allowed to pass based on the security access policy (col. 8, lines 32-48).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 9, 12 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 9, line 11 should be changed to "an accessing device that accesses to the

Art Unit: 2625

specified server in order to acquire". Similar corrections are required for claims 12 and 13. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima '894, and further in view of Fan '706.

Referring to **claim 9**, Shima '894 discloses a printing apparatus that performs printing based on data acquired from a server on a network, comprising:

a reception device that receives a network address of a server on the network from an information processing apparatus (URL storage subsection 20 of Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 10-13, stores the URL specified by the host computer); and

an accessing device that accesses the specified server in order to acquire data from the specified server (receive control section 16 of Fig. 9, col. 5, lines 6—67, accesses a web page address and downloads information).

Shima '894 does not disclose expressly determining whether access to the server is permitted based on access restriction information.

Fan '706 discloses a registration device (col. 4, lines 1-7, memory storing access control list) that registers access restriction information, the access restriction

Art Unit: 2625

information including a plurality of network addresses of servers on the network and indicating whether access to each of the servers is permitted or restricted (col. 8, lines 49-59, access control list specified the addresses of communicating hosts);

a determination device (col. 3, lines 57-61, a processor compares packet header information with the access control criteria) that determines, based on the access restriction information, whether the access to the server that is specified by the network address received by said reception device is permitted or restricted (step 406 of Fig. 4, col. 9, lines 16-23, determines whether the packet meets authorization criteria including IP address); and

allowing access in a case where it is determined that the access to the specified server is permitted (step 414 of Fig. 4, col. 9, lines 60-67, allows packet to pass to address);

wherein said accessing device does not access the specified server in a case where it is determined that the access to the specified server is restricted; and wherein said determination device determines whether the access to the specified server is permitted or not in accordance with default settings in a case where the network address received by said reception device is not included in the access restriction information (col. 8, lines 32-38, uninvited packet [not listed in the access control list] may be allowed to pass based on the security access policy).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to determine whether a printer can access a server based on access restriction information. The motivation for doing so would have been to protect the system from

Art Unit: 2625

attempts to steal information or disrupt functions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Fan '706 with Shima '894 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Referring to **claim 10**, Fan '706 discloses wherein the access restriction information further includes protocol information indicating a protocol that is used to access each of the servers (col. 8, lines 32-48, restriction policies could include IP protocol field).

Referring to **claim 11**, Fan '706 discloses wherein the access restriction information further includes port number information indicating a port number that is used to access each of the servers (col. 9, lines 16-31, access control criteria could include protocols identified by port numbers).

Referring to **claim 12**, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Referring to **claim 13**, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2625

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter K. Huntsinger whose telephone number is (571)272-7435. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Peter K. Huntsinger/

Application/Control Number: 10/698,043

Page 7

Art Unit: 2625

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625